

REMARKS

Claims 60-78 are currently pending in this application. All claims are rejected. No claims are amended. New claims 79-82 are added. Applicants have amended the specification to remove a sentence referring to an undisclosed reference. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is added as written description support for the new claims and amended specification exists in the specification and claims as originally filed.

The present invention is generally directed to processes for modifying or treating the surface of a device by coating the surface with a complex coacervate core micelle composition comprising a block copolymer to render said surface protein-resistant.

Interview Summary

Applicants thank Examiners Kassa and Woodward for the courtesy of the interview held on July 28, 2011, with counsel for Applicants. During the interview, the rejection over Harada in view of Decher was discussed.

Applicants understood the Examiners to acknowledge Applicants' argument at the interview that the combination of Harada and Decher does not render the present invention *prima facie* obvious because the combination of Harada and Decher fails to teach "coating said surface with a composition comprising at least one polymeric micelle." As previously discussed, Harada does not disclose coating a surface with its polymer compositions, and Decher does not teach coating surfaces with polymeric micelles. Decher teaches stepwise deposition of polymers onto a substrate to construct a layered polymer film. *See* Decher at Fig. 1. Applicants' counsel pointed out that deposition of polymerers onto a surface does not suggest to one of ordinary skill

in the art that micelles, which are organized structures typically found in solution, could successfully be applied to a surface.

Nevertheless, Applicants understood that the Examiners believed it would be possible to find additional prior art disclosing deposition of polymeric micelles onto a surface that would render the pending claims obvious. The Examiners did suggest, however, that claims might be patentable with clarification that the micelle coating occurs in a single step.

Because Applicants have not had an opportunity to review and respond to any rejection based on additional prior art, Applicants have not amended the independent claims and maintain that the pending claims are patentable over Harada in view of Decher for the reasons discussed above and in the Request for Reconsideration after Final Office Action filed February 10, 2011. Applicants further submit that the claims rejected over Harada in view of Decher in further view of Karymov are also patentable because Karymov does not remedy the deficiencies discussed with regard to the combination of Harada and Decher.

In addition, Applicants are presenting new claims 79-82, which recite that the coating of the micelles occurs in a single step. Applicants respectfully submit that the new claims are separately patentable over Harada and Decher as discussed during the interview.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. If any issues remain, Applicants request, as appropriate, the courtesy of a phone call to their counsel below.

Respectfully submitted,

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP

Dated: August 10, 2011

By: 

Robert M. Schulman
Registration No. 31,196

Dwight M. Benner II
Registration No. 52,467

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP
1900 K Street, N.W., Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20006-1109
(202) 955-1500 (telephone)
(202) 778-2201 (facsimile)